

ARIZONA

Cathryn A. Pulsifer, Camp Verde.
Donald L. Remm, Casa Grande.
Alice L. Maxwell, Chinle.
Nancy R. Caldwell, San Simon.

ARKANSAS

Nettie E. O'Roark, South Fort Smith.

CALIFORNIA

Elizabeth Waldron, Blue Jay.
Ethel M. Stott, Diablo.
Eugene M. Freitas, Herlong.
George P. Ashmun, Hughson.
Eugene A. Guerretaz, Orick.
Harry L. Smith, Perkins.
Donald P. Morrison, San Bruno.

COLORADO

George R. Newmyer, Center.
Charles Herman Klippel, Pueblo.
Ralph A. Nielson, Sanford.

GEORGIA

Homer E. Cook, Alto.
Adrian Dwight Massey, Canon.
Benjamin M. Woodruff, Sandy Springs.

HAWAII

Satoshi Ishimoto, Lihue.

IDAHO

James M. Lyke, Caldwell.
Leo G. Huguenin, Mullan.

ILLINOIS

LeRoy Davis, Harvel.
William C. Regan, Stronghurst.
Clifford E. Vaughn, Tiskilwa.
Clarence E. Harden, Tolono.

INDIANA

Edward A. Costomiris, Cicero.
Mary A. Stites, Deputy.
Ernest D. Littler, Dunkirk.
Vernice Dick Seward, Jr., Royal Center.
Wilfred E. Shoemaker, Yorktown.

LOUISIANA

Otis G. Darbonne, Grand Coteau.

MAINE

John E. Sargent, Fryeburg.
Kellen R. Melanson, St. Francis.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin L. Naylor, Dunstable.

MINNESOTA

Preston H. Anderson, Blackduck.
Carl O. Palmer, Buffalo.
Edmonde K. Evanson, Canby.
Ralph W. Breitenbach, Darwin.
Neil S. Rasmussen, Emmons.
Maurice J. Wenker, Freeport.
Harold J. Harris, Hanley Falls.
Kent S. Bigbee, Jeffers.
Irvin L. Yeiter, La Crescent.
Erwin D. Beutel, Lake Elmo.
Paul R. Norby, Mabel.
Alvord J. Ellingboe, Paynesville.
Rodger A. McRae, Swanville.
Duane J. Davis, Verndale.
John D. Mellinger, Warba.
Sidney M. Anderson, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Hade W. Sessums, Lena.

MISSOURI

Alfred C. Kennedy, Avondale.
Hobart C. Nicolay, Butler.
John R. Smith, Jameson.
Charles F. Hern, Jasper.
Vance A. Meares, Reeds.
Jesse O. Weaver, Steele.

MONTANA

Cecil J. Ranney, Alberton.
Ivan W. Small, Alder.
Donald W. Bell, Browning.

NEBRASKA

Edward A. Rodenburg, Deshler.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore R. Butler, Portsmouth.
George W. Carr, Winnisquam.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph S. Bird, Annandale.
Jacob Fetzner, Grenloch.
William T. Reedy, Iselin.
Laura A. Bradley, Monmouth Beach.
Erma B. Moncrief, Newport.
Ray W. Lingelbach, Port Republic.
William C. Conner, South Bound Brook.

NEW MEXICO

John R. Goddard, El Rito.

NORTH DAKOTA

Carl Raymond Culver, Dickinson.
LeRoy B. Wentz, Elgin.
Lawrence D. Larsen, Kindred.
Lillian R. Van Doren, Medora.
Ruby E. Omvig, Mylo.
Orris K. Rowe, New Leipzig.

OHIO

George B. Lewis, Blue Creek.
Ruben E. Spurrier, Buffalo.
William Edward Dornan, Canton.
Charles H. Walters, Circleville.
James W. Broad, Clyde.
Dale R. Wyker, Grove City.
Carrie Elizabeth Copley, Helena.
Gene F. Richards, Hollansburg.
James F. Church, Loudonville.
Carey W. Hodson, Mowrystown.
Edwin L. Seitz, Sebring.
James P. Emmitt, Tallmadge.

OKLAHOMA

Nell E. Neville, Altus.

OREGON

Lester W. Heise, Adams.
Nell L. Morfitt, Astoria.
John Gordon Watts, Beaver Creek.
Francis L. Norton, Blachly.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gladys V. Lacey, Buena Vista.
James E. Sutton, Evans City.
Richard M. Bitner, Lansdale.
Richard S. Chesonis, Lucernemines.
Henry R. Heintz, Perkiomenville.
Grace G. Hendricks, Trexlertown.
Richard J. Griffith, Trucksville.
Leslie E. Carlisle, Sr., Verona.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Manly D. Padgett, Edgefield.
Rodney A. Russell, Troy.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clayton L. Gibbs, Groton.
Philip S. Aldrich, Milbank.
Merton C. Matter, Orient.
Eva K. Gayken, Worthing.

TENNESSEE

Charles Ray Winton, Coalmont.
Raymond B. Cox, Cottage Grove.
Betty L. Milton, Duff.
Charles W. Meals, Gibson.

TEXAS

Edward H. Wester, Floydada.
James P. Fortenberry, Friona.

VERMONT

Harvey A. Dix, Brattleboro.

VIRGINIA

George Guy Farrar, Afton.
Carl C. Mason, Bridgewater.
Jane D. Nottingham, Carrollton.
Clinton Lewis Epperson, Lawrenceville.
Robert L. Via, Roanoke.
Harry L. Buston, Jr., Tazewell.

WEST VIRGINIA

Kenneth B. Rouzee, Kingwood.

WISCONSIN

Raymond E. Feller, Antigo.
Michael J. Stieber, Colby.
Benjamin F. Goehring, Random Lake.
Percy E. Braatz, Shiocton.
Francis Mattis, Stone Lake.

WYOMING

Bruce L. Bartholomew, Dayton.
LeRoy Williams, Grass Creek.
Noreen C. Hopkins, Story.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art always willing and able to bless us according to our needs, may we begin this new week with gladness and gratitude and continue it with calmness and courage.

Grant that in all our plans and purposes to serve our generation we may be inspired by the loftiest motives and employ the noblest means.

Show us how we may minister more effectively and efficiently to the welfare of all humanity, giving wise counsel to the baffled and perplexed, consolation to the sorrowing, companionship to the lonely, and strength to the burdened.

May we daily have within our hearts the joy of knowing that we are living useful and helpful lives and making a worthy contribution to a real and right solution of mankind's many difficult problems.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Bi-lox, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation;

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes;

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes; and

S. 3760. An act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico;

H. R. 7471. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.; and

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Ore.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill just messaged from the Senate, H. R. 10899, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRESTON, THOMAS, ROONEY, YATES, SHELLEY, FLOOD, CANNON, CLEVENGER, BOW, HORAN, MILLER of Maryland, and TABER.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPRO- PRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2250)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 14, 17, 31, 32, 33, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 36 and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,369,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,862,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$44,300,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964, 965), as amended, \$48,500."

And the Senate agree to the same. The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 10, 16, 18, 27, 28, and 35.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WM. F. NORRELL,
ALFRED D. SEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Research in the utilization of saline water

The conferees concur in the statement of the House report to the effect that the \$50,000 reduction in the budget estimate is to apply to the item of administration and coordination.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$2,835,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Minerals Mobilization

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$300,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$18,369,-300 for management of lands and resources instead of \$18,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,738,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Permits the purchase of 31 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 25 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$50,720,-000 for education and welfare services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$16,200,-000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$5,240,000 for construction, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House, and \$7,740,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the construction program as set forth in the justifications and recognize the need of future appropriations to cover the total costs.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Permits the purchase of 290 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 270 as proposed by the House.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Permits the purchase of 126 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 100 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$15,862,-750 for conservation and development of mineral resources, instead of \$15,363,000 as proposed by the House, and \$17,363,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds for mining research at the oil shale plant, Rifle, Colorado, have been disallowed. Of the increase above the House figure, \$100,000 is for laboratory research on oil shale and shale oil at Laramie, Wyoming.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$11,562,-000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,480,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would have made the construction appropriation immediately available.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$15,250,-000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would have made the construction (liquidation of contract authorization) appropriation immediately available.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$10,373,-600 for management of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,696,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,105,-000 for investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,065,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$2,471,-000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Permits the purchase of 131 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 97 as proposed by the House.

General provisions, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 23: Strikes out House language limiting funds for informational services.

*TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES**Department of Agriculture**Forest Service*

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$44,-300,750 for national forest protection and management instead of \$41,668,000 as proposed by the House and \$46,063,500 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase above the House figure, \$250,000 is for soil and water management, and \$620,000 is for reforestation.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$10,000,-000 for forest research instead of \$9,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts a heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$12,190,-000 for state and private forestry cooperation instead of \$11,385,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,165,000 as proposed by the Senate. An increase of \$495,000 above the House figure has been provided for cooperation in forest tree planting and \$310,000 for cooperation in forest management and processing.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$200,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$185,000 as proposed by the House and \$210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31-34: Appropriate \$1,250,000 for land acquisition as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide for allocations as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,425,-000 for salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$1,505,-000 for salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,495,000 as proposed by the House.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$48,500 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur, as follows: Nos. 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 7, insert " , of which not to exceed \$240,000 may be paid to the Municipal School District No. 1, Sandoval County, N. Mex., to supplement an allocation of funds from the Office of Education for the construction of elementary public school facilities which shall be available to Pueblo Indian children."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 11, line 7, strike out "and the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C." and insert "and for the Geological Survey or the General Services Administration to acquire a site and to prepare plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., without regard to Revised Statutes, page 3709, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 302 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252 (c))."

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 16, line 4, insert " , of which not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 34, line 23, insert:

"WEEKS ACT"

"For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521), \$100,000, to be available only for payment of the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 35, line 9, insert:

"SPECIAL ACTS"

"For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forest, in accordance with the provisions of the following act authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amount from such receipts: Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 40, line 7, insert " : *Provided further*, That the employment of not more than one person by contract or otherwise, pursuant to the third sentence of section 2 (c) of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended by the act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 783), may be extended for an additional year."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 17, line 2, insert "": *Provided*, That all receipts from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "": *Provided*, That all receipts for the fiscal year 1957 from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SEGREGATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues, I have recently been faced with a primary campaign in my district, which is the Eighth District of Florida. I am humbly grateful to the wonderful citizens of our district because they gave me an overwhelming majority over my opponent. I have always tried to the best of my ability to keep every campaign promise, and I emphasized to our people in my recent campaign my determination to present their viewpoints in Congress concerning the problems of segregation in our public schools, which the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional 2 years ago. I pledged to my people that I would do everything within the law to maintain segregation in our public schools. I repeat a statement concerning the Supreme Court's decision on segregation that I made in Congress over 2 years ago:

Let me tell you the attitude of the majority of the people of both races in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, which I represent. They view this decision as fraught with dangers comparable to the tragedies of World Wars I and II, and the emergence of the Communist terror.

I did not exaggerate the situation then, and I find in the light of my recent campaign that, if anything, I understated the attitude of the majority of the citizens of the Eighth District of Florida.

I believe that those of us who live in the Deep South should make every effort calmly, but honestly, to present to the Nation the great tragedy of a Supreme Court decision that discounts the Jeffersonian conception of States rights, and takes away from our separate States those rights that were delegated to them specifically in the Constitution. I do not believe this problem of segregation in our public schools will ever be solved satisfactorily unless we revert to the theory of States rights. I believe Florida should be given the privilege of handling this problem as Florida sees best to handle it. I ask for the same privilege on the part of the other 47 States in the Union.

I know just about everything has already been said on this subject that could be said, but I want to present one thought that perhaps is a little different. Some of the critics of the Supreme Court's decision on segregation have suggested that the members of the Court based their ruling on sociology rather than on law. If the decision were based on sociology, may I say that I do not believe it was based on sound sociological principles. One of the basic facts a sociologist learns is that you cannot legislate the mores and traditions of a people. Yet by a Supreme Court decision which has the effect of legislation, we are trying to legislate the mores and traditions of many millions of our citizens.

One thing that many of the fine people I represent in the Eighth District of Florida resent is the fact that in so many of our northern newspapers we never have presented the factual problems that have been provoked by the integration of races. In this connection, I would like to include an article from one of the great newspapers of Florida, the Florida Times-Union in its issue of Thursday, May 31, 1956. This article concerns rioting by Negro teen-agers on a vessel plying between Buffalo and Crystal Beach amusement park in Ontario. The article points out that the Negro teen-agers turned the vessel into a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers. The article further points out that of the approximately 1,000 persons who made the trip, about 80 percent were Negroes and that most of the trouble was caused by gangs of Negro girls who walked the deck, attacking and molesting young white girls. The complete article follows:

NEGROES ATTACK WHITES ON SHIP

BUFFALO, N. Y., May 30.—Rioting by Negro teen-agers on a vessel plying between here and Crystal Beach amusement park in Ontario tonight turned the vessel into a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers.

The riots broke out on the *Canadiana* after a day of disorders at the amusement park.

Fourteen persons were injured at the park, and nine Buffalo youths were arrested by Ontario provincial police. Five of those arrested were Negroes and four were white.

Three teen-aged youths were taken into custody by Buffalo police when the ship docked, but no charges were placed against them immediately.

Courier-Express reporters Margaret Wynn and Dick Hirsch described the boat trip as a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened teen-agers.

HIDE IN DINING ROOM

They said the youngsters, several beaten or cut, cowered below decks in the ship's dining room for most of the trip after being attacked or threatened by the many Negro teen-agers who made up the majority of the passengers.

"Above deck," the reporters wrote, "all hell had broken loose as roving groups of Negroes calmly attacked the outnumbered whites."

"Girls were beaten mercilessly and youths who attempted to defend them were slugged and kicked without feeling."

UNABLE TO KEEP ORDER

"Members of the ship's crew and private police vainly attempted to keep order, but when one fight was broken up, another flared in a different portion of the weather-beaten boat."

"Of the approximately 1,000 persons who made the trip, about 80 percent were Negroes."

"Most of the trouble was caused by gangs of Negro girls who walked the deck, attacking and molesting young white girls."

Members of the Canadian crew told the newsmen that the demonstration was the worst on record.

You see, Mr. Speaker, in certain areas of the South the white race is in the minority. Now when you get a national minority who are in the majority in certain areas of our great country anyone who understands anything at all about the problems of this great Republic of ours can realize the dangers of such a situation.

The only answer is a return to the Constitution—a return to the Jeffersonian conception of States rights. There are many of us who have found that the Supreme Court's encroachment has manifested itself into other areas properly reserved to the States by the Constitution, and I am hoping with all my heart that we can agree on legislation that will be effective in returning to the States their sovereign rights. I shall certainly support such legislation at every opportunity. America is a republic. We are a sovereign nation composed of sovereign States. Rights not specifically granted to the Federal Government are reserved for the States. That is the Constitution of our beloved country. We must return to the Constitution in this grave crisis.

INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States pronounced an edict which already has had a profound impact, and promises to have an even greater one, on the basic way of life in many of our States, and in the Deep South in particular. I refer to the amazingly broad interpretation placed by the Supreme Court on the 14th amendment to our Constitution, an amendment which became effective July 28, 1868. This far-reaching interpretation holds that the various States may not segregate white

and Negro children in their public schools solely on the basis of race.

The 14th amendment states that—

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

I believe that this broad interpretation would actually work both ways: integration could be as much an abridgment of the rights of white children as segregation supposedly is an abridgment of the rights of Negro children.

From the date the 14th amendment became effective, July 28, 1868, until May 17, 1954, a period of 86 years, the executive branch of our Government, both State and Federal, the National Congress, the State legislatures, and the Federal and State courts made clear that under the Constitution of the United States power to control public schools in the States was reserved for each State, that a State could establish and operate schools for white and Negro children, and that by so doing there would be no conflict with the letter and intent of the 14th amendment. Just why the nine men who made up the Supreme Court in 1954 chose to go so far afield in their interpretation after these many years is something that I cannot answer. I do know that this decision has resulted in near chaos throughout the South, and is giving a fine outlet to those forces in our midst who are ever seeking some occasion to raise a hue and cry for the so-called oppressed and impoverished underdog, in whom they are interested not one whit, except as a means to further their own cause.

Let us say this, however, to those who would rush in precipitously to force an unacceptable social and educational system upon the South. The Supreme Court decree has awakened the South—and there are signs that enlightened elements in the North are stirring. We realize that the rights that have historically been preserved to the States must be preserved inviolate if we are to keep our Federal system of government. I am not speaking merely of the right to maintain separate schools, for this is only one of the many rights that have long belonged to the individual States. If the Constitution of our land can be so freely and so arbitrarily interpreted, what is there to prevent the same thing happening in the Bill of Rights, or any one of the other amendments? There is nothing but the people—and I say this to you today—if there is a need for a change in our basic law, then it can only be done by lawful process, not by judicial decree. The good people of the South, white and colored, have always been in the thick of the battle, when the cause was just. This battle, though it will be fought by every legal means, and not with weapons of war, is perhaps one of the most important the people of the country as a whole have ever been called upon to wage. The challenge has been thrown down. It is our way of life versus anarchy.

It will be interesting to note the qualifications and experience of the nine members of the Supreme Court in 1954. Justice Hugo Black had prior qualifying judicial experience only as police judge

for 18 months. Justices Harlan and Minton were the only other members of the Supreme Court with prior judicial experience and, interestingly enough, their prior judgeships were appointive in nature. The other members of the Supreme Court did not have prior judicial experience. While these nine men who are political appointees are charged with great powers and responsibility in their positions on the Supreme Court of the United States, I cannot help but feel that these men—like all human beings—are subject to human frailties. They can make mistakes. They can be subjected to pressure and influences. Must the customs and the traditions and the way of life of millions of American citizens be completely revamped because the Supreme Court suddenly saw fit to reverse prior rulings?

I have never in the past, nor will I ever in the future, suppressed or stood in the way of the progress of any segment of the masses which make up our fine American citizenry. On the contrary, I have personally done what I could to help my fellow man, regardless of race, creed, or color. I have only to point to one of the basic principles which has been fostered by the Long family in Louisiana, and which was inaugurated and given a great start by my brother, the late Huey P. Long, former Governor of Louisiana and United States Senator. Louisiana was one of the first States to abolish the poll tax. When free schoolbooks were given by Huey P. Long, they were given to all schoolchildren, regardless of race, color, or creed. The free lunch program likewise was initiated by my brother, Earl Long, now Governor, for the third time, of the State of Louisiana.

For several years before I was grown, a family of colored people, including about 6 boys and 2 girls, lived on my father's farm some 200 yards from my home. My older brother and I played and went fishing with these colored boys. We often went to their house before breakfast, because their mother was a wonderful cook. My father found out that we were eating breakfast at this home, and threatened to whip us if we imposed on this family any longer. One morning, however, when my father was away, my brother Julius and I once again slipped over for breakfast. Our father returned and called us. We rushed home, and, my older brother, knowing what was coming, let me take the lead. When father reached me he began to whip me, not so much for visiting the colored family, but for taking food out of their mouths and for disobedience. I howled as if I were experiencing great pain, when suddenly an old Catahoula hog dog rushed to my rescue, and began to pinch father in the seat of the pants. That ended the beating, for father took off after the dog. I learned two lessons that day. One was that I should obey my father in the future. I also learned that right-thinking white people are, and always have been, considerate of the colored people. I merely recite this to show that I was not brought up to hate people because of their color, and what I am saying here today is as much in the interest of the

good colored people as it is the white. I have discussed this matter with many fine people of the colored race, including preachers, lawyers, doctors, and farmers, and, with the exception of a few who belong to the NAACP, I have found that they would sincerely regret to see the segregation barriers broken down. They want their schools and their teachers. They want their churches and their preachers. They want their families. That is exactly what we all want, and is what we are trying to preserve.

The great tragedy of the present situation is that the people who are most closely involved with the nine-man decision, the people, Negro and white, who know the situation, are strongly against it. Intelligent, informed people in the North are against it. Who, then, are the ones that are fanning the flames most violently? Communist-inspired organizations are in the forefront of a nefarious plot to dupe the innocent Negro and cause the white man to become an object of hatred. Does anyone here think that these actions are taken because of any real sympathetic feeling for the colored race? The Communists have vowed not to rest until the United States becomes subject to their power, and they are at present concentrating their power against the South. By turning brother against brother, by turning race against race, they hope to succeed in demoralizing one great segment of our country. With the South as a base for their insidious fomenting of dissension, the enslavement of the whole Union will be much simpler. For if you can turn two races of people against each other, people who have lived and worked side by side in peace and harmony for over 200 years, by a program of slander and hypocrisy, then think of the tremendous possibilities; first, white against black; then Catholic against Protestant; labor against capital; city dweller against farmer. Friends, it is the old, old slogan of Divide and conquer. They are trying to divide us now. If they succeed, they will not stop until the whole Nation is conquered. We would be judged guilty of cowardice by future generations if we in the South did not take the stand set forth in the southern manifesto, a noble and courageous document.

I am impressed by an article concerning the question of integration written by a prominent northern Negro editor. His comments, with which I agree, reflect the opinion of serious minded and informed persons throughout our Nation, and are in opposition to the so-called bleeding hearts, radicals, rabblers, agitators, and the just plain uninformed in our midst. What do those people really want; equal educational opportunity for the Negro or just plain integration? Most people who have studied the situation agree that the southern Negro is better off educationally than the northern Negro, because an honest effort is being made to give the southern Negro an equal opportunity to get an education, new job opportunities are becoming daily more available, and the Negro is able to take a position of leadership in all fields on a fairly segregated basis. For example, there are Negro doctors, lawyers, dentists, storekeepers, businessmen,

farmers, and workmen who, in a semi-segregated area, are able to maintain and live in an atmosphere of harmony with all and in a position of full leadership. In a completely integrated society, what intelligent person thinks that the Negro can operate in a position of full leadership and withstand the pressures of competition in a single economic unit? He does very well under the present arrangement of a dual-economic system.

If the southern Negro is seeking a greater educational opportunities, we have only to look about us to see that he is getting them. He plays the major role in an educational system which he directs. I firmly believe that racial problems cannot be solved by mixing the races. The Negro welcomes the opportunity to run his own schools, hospitals, churches, civic and social organizations. I do not think the Negro should be placed in the position of asking others to accept him into their society. He could attain a like objective by conducting himself in such a manner that all men would respect him for what he is as a person. Friendship between white and Negro would then have a concrete and natural basis. The Negro would do better to put forward qualified leaders in his race, to show his fellow Negroes how to make the most of the opportunities they already have. In my opinion, the southern Negro is being made the dupe of the biased, the radicals, and the uninformed.

To understand the great problem confronting the South brought about by the question of integration, we must first understand why the South differs from other sections of the country on this question. The Negro makes up approximately 10 percent of the overall population of the United States. In the 11 States of the Deep South are to be found 60 percent of all the Negroes in the United States. Since these 11 Southern States contain only 24 percent of the overall national total of all races in the United States, the ratio of Negro to whites is 1 to 4. Nationwide the ratio of Negro to whites is 1 to 10. California has only 4 percent Negro population; Pennsylvania, 5 percent; Indiana, 4 percent; Illinois, 7 percent; New York, 6 percent; and it is logical that these and other States with such a low percentage of Negro population can neither understand nor share the problems of integration which are visited upon our Southern States. For example, Alabama has 32 percent Negro population; Mississippi, 45 percent; South Carolina, 39 percent; Louisiana, 33 percent, and Georgia, 31 percent Negro population. With such a vast difference in the basic problems involved, it is only natural that a wide divergence in opinion concerning the whole issue should exist. The average Negro family in most areas being larger than the average white family, integration would necessarily result in many classrooms containing up to 50 percent or more Negro children. Obviously, there is a tremendous difference then in those classrooms being affected in this manner by integration and in those classrooms outside the South which would contain, for example, only 3, 4, or 5 percent Negro children.

It is extremely important that the high percentage of Negro population in the South be kept in mind in viewing the problems confronting integration. It is easy for the uninformed to shout for integration immediately, to insist that the southern Negro is oppressed and downtrodden, and that the only solution is through immediate integration; to insist that the South overcome decades and decades of tradition and custom and habits to accommodate the edict of nine Supreme Court Judges; that eyes be closed to mental, moral, and social barriers. No thinking person can fail to see the fallacy of immediate integration.

Segregation is nothing new in this world. In fact, it governs all forms of life in the world of nature—be it animal, vegetable, or mineral. Such rules are influenced by many factors which develop a basis for segregation, and the same is true of human beings. Some races and groups are held together by common bonds of temperament or culture and of physical characteristics which do not lend themselves to intermingling with other races and groups. Various species of fish segregate themselves. The birds of the air are clannish and are not inclined to intermingle. Even similar forest growths and plants and shrubs are inclined to stick together. It is certainly logical that this plan of life would carry over into human beings. Any attempt to go contrary to nature and to force integration will only result in discontentment, confusion, and a complete disruption of the orderly process of life.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 521, Rept. No. 2254), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1840, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill, H. R. 1840, it shall be in order to move to strike out the number H. R. 1840 and title and provisions thereof and to substitute in lieu thereof the number H. R. 11 and the title and provisions thereof; provided, however, that such motion shall not be debatable.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a letter to Arthur F. Burns, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, notified him as follows:

I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as Chairman.

I should like to compliment the President and this administration on the recognition of the importance of small concerns and the many men and women serving their community in this capacity.

In establishing this Committee the President has designated as members the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Administrator of Small Business Administration.

In his communication the President definitely expects this Committee to make specific recommendations, not only for administrative action, but also for additional legislation that will strengthen the economic position of small business as well as promote and develop the opportunities of all small-business concerns throughout the Nation so they may continue to benefit in the excellent economic progress we are now experiencing. I enclose the letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1956.

The Honorable ARTHUR F. BURNS,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The important contributions made by small-business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use. Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons, Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

The Federal Government has a number of programs now in operation that are significantly helpful to small businesses.

The Department of Commerce helps constantly in the solution of management problems for small businesses through its Office of Technical Services, Office of Area Development, Business and Defense Services Administration, and Office of Business Economics.

Financial assistance is available to small concerns through the Small Business Administration.

Jointly with the Department of Defense and with other Federal departments and agencies, the Small Business Administration assists small concerns in obtaining Government procurement contracts.

Many small construction companies and related businesses benefit from the home financing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Office of Defense Mobilization seeks to strengthen the production potential of small firms in our defense programs.

Through its enforcement of the antitrust laws, the Department of Justice helps maintain the competitive environment that is essential to the Nation's economic welfare.

These and other programs and policies of the Federal Government facilitate the establishment of new concerns and foster the growth of small businesses. Yet the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small businesses should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance.

To this end I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as Chairman. By copies of this letter I am designating the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as members. Other department and agency heads will participate on an ad hoc basis as may be deemed desirable. The Committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small businesses and to foster their sound development.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and at the conclusion of my remarks to extend my remarks by the addition of a speech made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] addressed the Georgia Bar Association convention at Savannah on May 25, 1956. Every Member of this body knows that the Georgia bar could not have selected one more competent, courageous, and ethical. His address was most scholarly, factual, and illuminating. His address reflects tireless work over many years and a complete devotion to constitutional government. Our colleague pointed out facts concerning our Supreme Court and its personnel that few others have tried to discover. Everyone knows that when this colleague speaks, he has the facts and logic to sustain him. This House and our Nation should have the privilege of reading that address, which follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow members of the Georgia Bar Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I am conscious of the high privilege which it is to address this association. I appreciate deeply the invitation to participate in your program today.

It is a particular pleasure to talk to the association while Henry Bowden is our president. I have for many years regarded him as one of Georgia's outstanding lawyers, and during my entire acquaintance with him, I have held him in affectionate regard.

I take this opportunity to compliment him and the association upon the year of splendid progress we have experienced under his wise, able, and energetic leadership.

May I express also the pleasure which is mine to be presented by my good friend, JACK FLYNN, our immediate past president of the association. I knew him well and appreciated his talents when he was in the active practice of law, and while serving as solicitor general of the Griffin judicial circuit. I have observed him closely in Washington where he has diligently applied himself to the task of representing Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. He is making the same reputation in Washington which he has already made in Georgia as a man who has the courage of his convictions, who is capable and efficient, who is a tireless worker for his constituents, and an effective fighter for the principles in which he believes.

We are facing today, I believe, the most critical period which America has faced since 1776, when a small group of men met in Philadelphia to choose between security and peace on the one hand, which could be purchased at the price of continued submission to tyrannical oppression, or revolution and war with the world's greatest power on the other hand. With the certain knowledge that years of misery and suffering lay ahead, that they would fight against heavy odds, and that defeat and death might be the portion of everyone who participated, they believed in their hearts that free government was worth the price they had to pay. They threw their all into the balance as they fought for it. Our Government of liberty, freedom, and opportunity today is the result of that choice and of the fight which they made.

Freedom was not just a topic of idle conversation with them. Integrity was more than a word in the dictionary.

In setting up a constitution to guarantee free government, they were aware that their liberty was hard won. They knew that ambitious human beings are selfish and ruthless, and they knew that human rights can be whittled away little by little by ambitious schemers.

They, therefore, set up this Government of ours to function as three coequal departments, each of the three separate from and independent of the others. The foundation of this free Government was a written Constitution. It was put in writing so that its lasting principles would not be subject to passing whims or fancies. They provided a specific way to amend the document if changing times and conditions ever required it. All of us are familiar with that method of amendment. Nothing less than a vote of two-thirds of the Congress ratified by three-fourths of the States will serve to change it. Without this concurrent action not a sentence or word of the Constitution can be changed.

Among his other great qualities, President George Washington was a wise statesman. He knew the need for reciprocal checks and balances in maintaining free government. Looking ahead to the future of this new Government, he feared that these reciprocal checks and balances might be upset by one of the three departments usurping the functions of another. Warning against this danger, he said in his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Today our free Government faces the danger which George Washington feared, and against which he warned us in the words I have just repeated. This danger comes from attempts by the Supreme Court of the United States to usurp functions which it

does not possess, functions which belong exclusively to the Congress and to the States.

For nearly a century and a half the Supreme Court deserved the respect which it received. It justified the confidence of the people that it would uphold the Constitution. It proclaimed the Constitution as written, regardless of consequences, knowing that the people had the power to amend it, if and whenever amendment became necessary. During the period I refer to, the personnel of the Court were selected primarily because of demonstrated legal ability. They possessed the necessary integrity and fidelity to the Constitution to function within their own prescribed jurisdiction. The Supreme Court as then constituted, was a roadblock in the pathway of any person or group who sought to destroy or weaken our Government and its systems of checks and balances. The Court refused to trifle with the Constitution.

Then came the era of Court-packing. A President of the United States contemptuously referred to the Supreme Court as "nine old men." He asked the Congress to vote him legal authority to pack the Court by increasing its membership. When Congress refused to grant this authority, he asked the people to purge the Congress of those courageous Members who refused to pack the Court with rubberstamp reformers. The people refused to request to purge. They endorsed the Court for its fidelity to constitutional functions. They endorsed the Congress for its refusal to pack the Court.

But the passage of time and the occurrence of vacancies gave the opportunity to pack the Court which Congress and the people had denied. Court-packing became the vogue. It is still the vogue in our Government.

We saw an era then in which the Supreme Court entered upon an orgy of usurping legislative functions, and rewriting the Constitution. It was obvious to anyone who would take the trouble to look that the Court was following a pattern of overruling long-settled previous decisions and of usurping the functions of Congress and the States in changing the meaning of our Constitution through so-called interpretation. I began to point this out on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1949. I warned of the Court's attempt to legislate judicially, and I said then:

"It is time for the bar of the Nation to take note of this practice. It is time for Congress to take note of it, and time for the people to take note of it."

"One of the evils of such a system is that it destroys respect for both the courts and the law."

"The decisions of such a court have no permanent value as precedents."

Just recently I obtained from the Library of Congress a table showing that in the 14-year period from 1937 to 1951 the Supreme Court rendered 39 so-called judicial decisions arbitrarily overruling previous decisions of the Court. In some of these decisions the Court overruled only one case. In some they arbitrarily overruled two previously decided cases. In some they overruled as many as 3 decisions in 1 case. In 1 case, they overruled 5 previous decisions.

The trend of the Supreme Court as presently constituted has been to flout the law and the Constitution; to regard the whole body of the law as an uncharted sea; to arrogate unto themselves complete authority to make law as they think it should be made, to arbitrarily overrule with 1 stroke of the pen 1 decision, 3 decisions, 5 decisions, or any number of decisions which do not conform to their pattern of Government changing, and finally to read into the United States Constitution language and meaning which is not there, and which the Court, the Congress, and the people concurrently agreed for 164 years so far as the Constitution itself is concerned, and for 86 years, so far as the 14th amendment is concerned, was never intended to be a part of the Constitution.

Probably the hardest blow struck at our Constitution by this present Supreme Court was the school segregation decision of May 17, 1954.

In that case all pretense at following the law was dropped by the Court. Its decision in substance and effect was that changing times and conditions require a changed interpretation of the 14th amendment, and we hereby change it.

This judicial fiat was not supported by legal authority. It overruled as an arbitrary edict all the previously established and settled law on the subject. Instead of citing legal authority, it cited only sociological works and treatises. Many of the authors of the authorities cited are well known to have numerous Communist front connections.

In addition to its departure from law and precedent, this Court which sets itself up as the arbiter of our destiny has demonstrated an inconsistency which is equaled only by its contempt for the Constitution and law. The Court affirmed the case of *Jones v. Opelika* (316 U. S. 584) at the October term, 1941. One year later, at the October 1942 term of the Court in the same case of *Jones v. Opelika*, on the same petition for certiorari, the Court reversed its decision set out in 316 United States 584. The language in the first decision of the case (316 U. S. 584) is just as firm, positive, and certain in support of the principle therein announced, as was the language holding exactly the opposite in the second decision of the case (319 U. S. 103).

On November 21, 1955, in case No. 436, *Cahill v. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company*, the Court granted a writ of certiorari and reversed a judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, thus taking the final step in affirming a verdict for \$90,000 damages in favor of Cahill. The railroad paid the money to the injured employee, who used a considerable portion of it in paying debts, buying a home, et cetera.

On May 14, 1956, the Court reversed itself, and solemnly held that its decision of November 21, 1955, was wrong, and that Cahill was not entitled to the money.

This wishy-washy dealing with the law, as the Court did in these cases, and the wholesale action of overruling previous decisions in 39 cases in 14 years, brings the Court into disrepute.

It raises doubts and questions in the minds of the public regarding not only this Court, but all courts and all law.

The man in the street can only wonder, "Is the law as uncertain as that? Is the meaning of the Constitution as uncertain as that?"

When the highest court in our land decides at one term of court that the law is one thing, and in the same case at the next term of court solemnly proclaims that the law is exactly the opposite of its previous decision, and then repeats the exact process 2 years later in another case, we have a feeling of sympathy with Mr. Bumble, Charles Dickens' character in *Oliver Twist*, who said, "If the law supposes that, the law is an ass, an idiot."

This custom of reckless dealing with the law has created apprehension and fears for our judicial system all over this country. Eminent lawyers and able writers have warned against the consequences of the Supreme Court's disregard of law and usurpation of powers not possessed by it. Even members of the Supreme Court, itself, in dissenting opinions, have voiced strong criticism of the Court's irresponsible actions. In the case of *Smith v. Allwright* (321 U. S. 649), Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court said:

"The reason for my concern is that the instant decision overruling one announced about 9 years ago tends to bring adjudica-

tions of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, 'good for this day and train only.'"

James P. Byrnes, a distinguished American who served as Secretary of State, United States Senator, Governor, and Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and who filled many other high Federal and State offices, has sharply criticized the Court in which he formerly served. In an article in the May 18 issue of U. S. News & World Report, former Justice Byrnes said, "The Supreme Court must be curbed." He makes this flat statement regarding the Court's public-school decision of May 17, 1954:

"The Court did not interpret the Constitution—the Court amended it."

In that article, he made a statement which the whole Nation would do well to note carefully. He said:

"Today, this usurpation by the Court of the power of the States hurts the South. Tomorrow it may hurt the North, East, and West."

The Court in its dictatorial attitude and evident determination to centralize power in Washington by striking down the powers of State government, has already struck at other States far from Georgia and the South.

In the case of *Slochower v. City of New York*, just decided, the Court struck down a law of the city of New York which required the discharge of a teacher who invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer when questioned as to membership in the Communist Party.

From the State of Pennsylvania, in the Steve Nelson case, the Court held that a Pennsylvania statute making subversive activities a criminal offense was unconstitutional on the ground that the Federal Government had enacted legislation on the same subject, and had thus preempted the right of the States to enact laws punishing subversive activities. This ties the hands of law-enforcement officers in every one of the 48 States so far as Communists and subversives are concerned.

While we are talking of the Supreme Court and communism, it is worthwhile to point out that for years Federal and State officials have been trying to rid this country of Harry Bridges and his pernicious influence. Bridges has been ordered deported by the Attorney General on the ground that he had affiliated with organizations advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and that he had been a member of the Communist Party. Bridges has been convicted of fraud against the United States in obtaining naturalization by perjury in denying membership in the Communist Party. And each time these cases have traveled the long route to the Supreme Court in Washington, that Court has found a way to reverse the findings against Bridges and permit him to continue his nefarious career in this country.

In the case of *Communist Party of the United States of America v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, decided less than a month ago, on April 30, this year, the Supreme Court rendered one of its most amazing decisions. In that case the Subversive Activities Control Board, after a lengthy and exhaustive hearing, found that there is a world Communist movement, organized and directed by a foreign government and that the Communist Party of the United States was a Communist-action organization. This action was begun on November 22, 1950. The Communist Party squirmed and resisted all the way through the court of appeals to the Supreme Court, where after 5½ years of litigation, the Supreme Court held that it could not pass upon a record in which the credibility of the witnesses, Paul Crouch, Harvey Matusow and Manning Johnson, had been attacked; this notwithstanding the fact that the court of appeals passed upon this very question, and held that the conclusion of the Board was supported by the basic

findings which it had affirmed, and further held that the testimony of the witnesses whose credibility was attacked was consistent with and supported by masses of other evidence.

When this astounding decision was announced the lawyers in the Justice Department in Washington were stunned. Some of them declared in public statements that this decision may prove to be the most important Communist victory in the courts within the past 10 years.

So shocking was the action of the Court that Justice Clark uttered one of the most stinging criticisms ever directed at the Court. In a dissenting opinion he said:

"The Court now says the court of appeals erred in its denial of the motion and remands the case directly to the Board for it to determine again the credibility of these three witnesses. It refuses to pass on the important questions relating to the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950, a bulwark of the congressional program to combat the menace of world communism. Believing that the Court here disregards its plain responsibility and duty to decide these important constitutional questions, I cannot join in its action."

"I have not found any case in the history of the Court where important constitutional issues have been avoided on such a pretext. . . . The action today is taken merely for delay and can result only in the Board reaffirming the action. In fact, it so advised the court of appeals and that court found all of the testimony of the questionable witnesses were supported by masses of other evidences. . . ."

"This proceeding has dragged out for many years now, and the function of the Board remains suspended and the congressional purpose frustrated at a most critical time in world history."

Recently I asked the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in Washington to furnish to me a list of cases in which the defendant was a Communist, or suspected of Communist activities, or charged with subversive activities, whose cases have been carried to the Supreme Court and the Communists received favorable decisions. There are 28 of such cases. They were decided in the 17-year period beginning with the year 1939. Included among them are such defendants as Harry Bridges, 3 cases; Judith Coplon, 2 cases; William Remington and Steve Nelson. Included among the list also is the Slochower case, striking down the New York City law which I have already referred to, and the case of *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, so strongly denounced by Justice Clark, whose dissenting opinion was concurred in by two other Justices.

The strange antics of this Court within the past 20 years have caused much wonderment as to why this Court which had functioned for so many years within its rightful jurisdiction, should change so radically as to transform itself from a dependable, responsible, and respected Court into an agency, which, masquerading under the guise of a court, began to devote itself to the task of nullifying existing law, legislating judicially to make new law where none existed before, and usurping power not possessed to amend the Constitution, while at the same time lending comfort and encouragement to radical movements and organizations which have grown bold and powerful during that period.

One cannot help but ask the question: Is this something that just happened unintentionally, or is it being done according to plan and program?

If there is a plan and program for the Supreme Court to change our form of government by usurping functions it does not possess, what possible explanation is there that the Court would lend itself to any such scheme?

I think there is no doubt that the Court is following such a pattern, and the explanation for it is that the Court is a packed Court, and the personnel of the Court are reformers whose primary goal is to change this Government of ours from a Republic of sovereign States into a bureaucratic Central Government, which shall be devoted not to the preservation of States rights, local self-government, and individual liberty, but shall be devoted to the promotion of socialistic doctrines, one-world government, and the radical philosophies of such groups as the Americans for Democratic Action, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and similar leftwing organizations. Its actions and its decisions in the past 20 years point directly to this conclusion.

To better understand the amazing actions and philosophy of some of the leaders of the Court, it is well to have a look at some of their activities before they went upon the Supreme Court bench.

Between 1937 and 1939 four appointments were made to the Supreme Court. Within 2 years Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, and Douglas were nominated and confirmed.

The name of Felix Frankfurter had been intimately associated with radical organizations for many years prior to his appointment to the position of Associate Justice.

From 1919 to at least 1937 Frankfurter was associated with the left-wing American Civil Liberties Union. He was on its national board. The American Civil Liberties Union received large sums of money, according to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from the notorious Garland fund which was noted for its support of Communists. From the same source comes the information that the American Civil Liberties Union provided bail for the trial of Communists at Gastonia, N. C., convicted of a conspiracy to kill the chief of police. A committee of the New York State legislature said of the American Civil Liberties Union that in the last analysis it was a supporter of all subversive movements. That organization had as its director for many years Roger N. Baldwin. The records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities show that Baldwin was formerly a member of the IWW, served a term in prison as a draft-dodger during the war, and testified to the committee that his organization upheld the right of an American citizen or an alien to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government. The United States House of Representatives special committee to investigate Communist activities in the United States said of the American Civil Liberties Union:

"The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law."

William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States was one of Frankfurter's fellow members in the Civil Liberties Union.

In 1927 Frankfurter was found speaking at public meetings in behalf of two convicted murderers and anarchists, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, to secure a pardon for them. In that effort, he was in league with Robert M. Hutchins, the present head of one of the most infamous leftwing organizations in the United States, the Fund for the Republic, whose energies and assets are being devoted to financing radical movements and organizations, and the philosophies of the NAACP.

In 1928 Frankfurter became a member of the legal committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the organization principally responsible for the existing hostility and strife between white and colored people. He remained on the legal committee of that radi-

cal organization until his appointment to the Supreme Court.

Frankfurter's affinity for radicals and radicalism was illustrated early in his career in his attitude toward the so-called Tom Mooney trials in San Francisco. Mooney, a labor agitator, with strong leanings toward the Bolsheviks of his day, had been convicted of first-degree murder, resulting from a brutal bombing in San Francisco which killed 10 people and wounded many others. Because of his Bolshevik connections, his conviction became an international incident.

In the Mooney proceedings, Frankfurter had a cloak to hide under. He had been appointed a mediators commissioner by President Wilson, and he operated from that base in the Mooney matter. He was unable to pull the wool over the eyes of former President Theodore Roosevelt, however. Roosevelt wrote him a letter, a part of which follows:

"MY DEAR MR. FRANKFURTER: I thank you for your frank letter. I answer it at length because you have taken, and are taking, on behalf of the administration an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia; an attitude which may be fraught with mischief in this country."

While Frankfurter was professor of law at Harvard, and consorting with such characters as William Z. Foster, Robert M. Hutchins, and others of various shades of pink and red, he was also engaged in placing such men as Alger Hiss in positions in Washington. Hiss, first recommended to Washington by Frankfurter, had a meteoric rise which terminated in the penitentiary through a conviction of perjury which branded him as a Communist.

It is of some significance that Alger Hiss worked for Justice Reed when Reed was in the Justice Department. It is significant also that Reed and Frankfurter (then both Justices on the Supreme Court) went to New York to testify in behalf of Hiss as witnesses to his good character. It is significant also that the jury did not believe that testimony and convicted Hiss.

Justice Reed went on the Supreme Court bench in 1938. In a publication entitled "Current Biography," he is quoted as having this philosophy regarding the Supreme Court:

"If by interpretation based on moderation, social and economic experiments, we can advance steadily toward our objective, we can avoid dangerous experiments of fundamental constitutional change."

This philosophy indicates an intention to change our Constitution not by constitutional amendment as prescribed by the Constitution itself, but by interpretation based on modern social and economic experiments.

These men are representative of the moral fiber which makes up our present-day Supreme Court.

Another irresponsible radical on the Court who brazenly asserts the claim that instead of being bound by the language of the Constitution, the Supreme Court may change its meaning to conform to the Court's ideas of modern needs is William O. Douglas. These quotations from a book he recently wrote are typical of his contempt for the Constitution upon which our free government is based:

"In nations like America and India that have written Constitutions, the judiciary must do more than dispense justice in cases and controversies. It must also keep the charter of government current with the times and not allow it to become archaic or out of tune with the needs of today."

"Today's new decision becomes a coveted anchorage for new vested interests. . . . It then takes an oncoming group from a new generation to catch the broader vision which may require the undoing of the work of their predecessors."

Under such befuddled and fuzzy thinking as this, the Constitution would cease to

have any meaning whatever. If that conception were correct, then actually we have no Constitution at all. Its written words lose their meaning. The people would lose their power to control the Constitution by amendment, because that power of amendment would have been usurped completely by the nine men who sit in the Supreme Court.

The following activities further illustrate the philosophy of Douglas: He said in a speech at the University of Teheran that Iran needed to make sweeping reforms, and should adopt a program embracing perhaps 10-percent Communism, 15-percent capitalism, and 75-percent something else.

In 1952, he accepted a \$1,000 award given by the CIO, an organization having a constant interest in much of the litigation which reaches the Supreme Court.

He urged in Tokyo that the Western Powers recognize Red China in the United Nations and unseat Nationalist China from the Security Council.

He wrote a dissenting opinion when the 11 top Communists were convicted and carried their case to the Supreme Court. In his dissent, he wrote that the freedom of speech of these Communists who were convicted under the Smith Act, was violated.

Yet, he supported the Smith Act in the Steve Nelson case which tied the hands of the 48 States so far as communism is concerned. When the issue was whether 11 convicted Communists should be punished, Douglas dissented. When the issue centered around encroaching on State's rights, plus freeing another convicted Communist, Douglas affirmed.

June 17, 1953, the day before the atomic spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, were scheduled for execution, he entered a stay of execution and left town. His order was invalidated by the Court, and the Rosenbergs were executed, but it did provide time and opportunity for Communists the world over to work up demonstrations elevating the Rosenbergs to martyrdom, something the Communists always seek.

Time does not permit a complete discussion of the radical affiliations and activities of the Supreme Court personnel.

Of the entire Supreme Court as it exists today, only two members had judicial experience before appointment to the Court, unless service as a city recorder could be counted judicial experience. In that event, three of the present Supreme Court members had judicial experience before going upon the bench of the highest Court of our land. Obviously, in this present era politics and radicalism outweigh legal ability and judicial experience.

When our Supreme Court has upon its bench men who have not only been associates and well-wishers, but active participants in the programs of such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, what can we expect when the radical philosophies of these organizations come before the Court for approval or disapproval? The wonder is that our Constitution has survived as well as it has.

If our free, constitutional Republic is to survive, protection must be afforded from these who are destroying it, whether they be zealous fanatics or merely well-meaning judges, determined to force radical doctrines upon an unwilling, but helpless, citizenry. The danger is greater now than it was in the thirties when the Executive undertook to pack the Supreme Court with a personnel willing to upset established precedents and to change the meaning of our Constitution.

A storm of protest went up then. But that protest was against a proposal to pack the Court.

The Court has now been packed. Our task now is to see to it that this packed Court does not destroy our Constitution and our Republic.

The wisdom of the ages is contained in the body of the law. If the statute law is to be changed, these changes should be made by the legislative branch. If the Constitution is to be changed, such changes should be made only by amendment.

It cannot be repeated too often—the Supreme Court has no right or authority to change the law or amend the Constitution. One of the principal reasons that liberty has survived in America, while perishing in nearly every other section of the world, is that our Government has been a government of laws and not a government of men.

Our Constitution has been manhandled by political appointees, screened and approved by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and Americans for Democratic Action. Their practice has been, during their incumbency on the bench, to say the law is one thing today and something else tomorrow. They are destroying our Constitution and the rights of States and individuals, and we are being told that we must accept these outrageous and fraudulent violations of our constitutional rights—that we are helpless to resist them. I say that such is not the case.

Members of the bar are usually the first to take notice of any encroachment upon the rights of its citizens. The bar has been the first to resist improper use of authority or illegal exercise of powers. An aroused bar can do much toward requiring the Supreme Court to stay within its proper sphere, even though it may chafe with impatience at the somewhat slower approach of the millennium through constitutional channels.

Let me urge you, as members of our great profession, to take your place in this critical era, in this vital controversy, on the side of legal procedure and constitutional government.

TRAGIC FARCE CORRECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the United Nations in disbanding the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea is an action which should be commended by all freedom loving people because it strikes a hard blow at the international Communist conspiracy. Those of us who have had an opportunity to visit Korea and to review first-hand the activities that have taken place there since the so-called truce, know full well now this Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission was used by the Communists to further their nefarious ends.

Last November during the course of an inspection trip to the Far East I spent 5 days in Korea and during that time had the opportunity to see firsthand the evidence which demonstrated beyond any question of doubt that the representatives of Communist-occupied Poland and Communist-occupied Czechoslovakia were, in fact, espionage and propaganda agents for the Kremlin. Much of this evidence was made available to me by the late Maj. Gen. Kim Chang Young, Chief

of the Counterintelligence Corps of the Republic of Korea Army.

Last February General Kim was struck down by the bullets of assassins on the streets of Seoul, Korea, during the early morning hours. In a statement I made before the House on February 1, drawing attention to the death of General Kim, I had the following to say apropos the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission:

While in Korea, I heard a great deal of talk about the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission which was provided for in the so-called armistice arranged during the Communist war of aggression in Korea. As you know, that Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission is supposed to inspect and report on the armed truce which now hangs so heavily over the people of Korea. This Commission is in no sense, a neutral nations commission because it includes in its membership representation of Communist-occupied Poland and Communist-occupied Czechoslovakia. It will be recalled that India agreed to accept the Chair of this Commission when it was set up. But soon after when the deal proved to be phony, the Indian general acting as Chairman could no longer stomach the tragic farce which involved his nation and he accordingly resigned the chairmanship and took the Indian troops back to India. Consequently, there remain four member nations on this so-called Supervisory Commission; in addition to the Communist Czechs and Poles, there are the Swedes and the Swiss. Because of all the talk I heard about this so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, I asked General Kim for his opinion on the matter. He hesitated to answer me, and he told me that he did not want to embarrass any of the governments of the free world by expressing his opinion on this matter. I assured him that truth could never be a matter of embarrassment to the American people.

It was at this point that General Kim took me to a set of files and exhibits relating to the activities of the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission. In those files was an abundance of evidence of a documentary character together with pictures showing that the Communist Poles and Communist Czechs serving as members of this mission engaged in both espionage and propaganda activities. From the evidence collected by General Kim and his staff, I have no doubt whatever but that the Communist world conspiracy regards the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea as nothing more than an instrument through which they can carry out espionage and propaganda. I need not add that our own military security officers were not in disagreement with the evaluation given to me by General Kim on this all-important question. It is to be regretted that the representatives of Switzerland and Sweden have continued to lend themselves to this tragic farce which only makes more difficult the task of enforcing the peace and bringing about eventual unity of Korea under one government, representative of the will of the people.

It is indeed encouraging to hear that the United Nations has discharged the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission and in doing so, announced to the world that it was not only a tragic farce, but that the Communist conspirators have been using it as a cover to the preparation of a wide range of activities which can lead only to a reopening of the war of Communist aggression in Korea. It is also noteworthy that the United Nations rejected the proposal of Red China for the opening of discussions on a final settlement in Korea.

The United Nations has rightfully found that the Chinese Communists are guilty of aggression in connection with the Korean war. It naturally follows that the United Nations would refuse to lift this condemnation by engaging in fruitless discussions with the Red Chinese on a settlement in Korea. The United Nations are to be congratulated for taking positive action to prevent any further damage to the cause of the free world by the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FAILURE OF CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE ACTIVITIES OF RACKETEERS AND EXTORTIONISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the television program Meet the Press, Victor Riesel took occasion to criticize the Congress because it had failed to investigate the activities of racketeers and extortionists who were bringing so much trouble and disgrace to legitimate labor organizations.

In his opinion the acid assault upon him was the result of his exposure of the racketeers and extortionists who have forced their way into unions which they now dominate.

In my judgment, his opinion and his criticism of the Congress was justified because heretofore on both sides of the aisle there has been opposition which seems to be dictated by fear of political retaliation from labor organizations, to any suggestion that the Congress make any investigation such as Mr. Riesel indicated should be made.

Well do I recall that in the Eightieth Congress, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and also as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, then known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, we undertook to expose some of these racketeers who were doing so much to injure the cause of organized labor. But we were shut off by individuals who were rather prominent in the political organization of the Republican Party, and there were some in the Democratic Party, not so many but some.

Of course, they, the Democrats, were more effective because in political organizations and in political maneuvering they have more ability than we have or else more courage or something, perhaps less regard for the methods they use than do we. They really go to town when they have charge of the organization. You have to hand it to them. That is why we got licked politically so often—that and their willingness to promise anything and everything regardless of their ability or willingness to deliver.

In the 83d Congress, an effort was made by me to iron out some difficulties on the question of jurisdiction that might arise between those two committees if an investigation such as suggested by Mr. Riesel was undertaken. It was my privilege to be a member of both.

At my request, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor did appoint a 3-man committee headed by our colleague from Kansas, WINT SMITH, and of which I was a member. It was my privilege to appoint a similar committee from the Committee on Government Operations. We held joint hearings in Detroit. We were well on the way toward exposing some of these racketeers, but at that time some Republicans stopped us again.

Later on, when the investigation got around to where it might reflect some discredit on the Governor of Indiana, who happened to be a Republican—I just happened to think of that just as this moment as a Republican from Indiana passed by—they stopped us once more. I recall that on that particular occasion our colleague from Kansas, Mr. SMITH, who was chairman of the joint committee, went out of the hearing room to answer a call from Washington. He came back and he said it was all off; we could not go ahead with anything that might involve the Governor of Indiana. One of the newspaper boys asked him who had called him out and he said, "Somebody away up there," and he pointed to the sky. Which ended that proposed investigation.

Later on the Committee on Government Operations, getting a little sore at me because of my crudeness and lack of finesse—I was so dumb I thought we should actually economize as well as talk economy, I do not know just what it is—took away my authority to go ahead with that investigation of racketeering. I had been advised when I went to Detroit that it might involve Jimmy Haffa, of the teamsters. You have all heard about him. If you have not, consult your labor directory and you will find him listed as the boss. Do not misunderstand me. I am not charging that Jimmy is taking any graft. He does not need to. His legitimate income from the union of which he is president is tremendous. He has on occasion hidden behind his wife's skirts and by forcing some of his union boys out of business aided her to a few thousand dollars' profit without much, if any, effort on her part. One of the unions of which he is president authorized him to spend as much of \$4 million for political campaign purposes as he might desire.

May I say to my colleague from Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, that he should thank the

good Lord Jimmy does not live in your district. With your views, if you would not take his orders—I know you would not—he would be after you come election day. Anyway, some of those who engineered that job of putting us off, or at least had something to do with it, did not win, even on a Republican ticket at that time. And so it has been all along. Political fear of a union boss who had no real political control of union votes has been effective.

I hope that the House will take cognizance of the present situation, because Victor Riesel has certainly paid a price for his opposition to those gangsters and their activities which no individual should be called upon to pay, which others will pay if the House does not have the courage to act. Perhaps now, because, being a member of the press or associated with the press, Victor is in a position to call for action and to make it so imperative, so necessary that we do something, maybe we will get a real investigation, something long overdue.

I hope we will, and I hope the Republicans will have a hand in it, and instead of cutting off this investigation as they did in the 80th and the 83d Congress and then giving the other group over there, with a Democrat at the head, an opportunity to go on, and they have, get the credit for an investigation which will clean up the present troubled situation.

I do not know why, as long as our position has always been known, we do not get a little of the credit which would come out of a fair, decent, effective investigation of those lawless oppressive activities.

The assault upon Riesel is an assault upon the right of a free press and free speech. As a matter of fact, neither party has anything to fear from the opposition of the labor leaders. That is true because the vast overwhelming majority of the members of the unions are just as honest and decent as the members of any other group. And they are just as independent, and I know in my own district they do not take the word of the boss as to how their vote should be cast. Actually the labor leaders so-called have little political power except as they use union funds to influence elections.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I heard the broadcast yesterday on Meet the Press, as the gentleman did. It was my understanding from what Mr. Riesel said that George Meany and Walter Reuther had spoken out against these racketeers in labor, and as I understood it they were willing for such an investigation to be conducted. Now, I do not know whether that was to be a congressional investigation or not, but it was my understanding that he stated on two occasions in that interview that both Meany and Reuther were against this kind of a policy. Now, was that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that was my understanding of what he said, but I do not go along with his views

on Walter Reuther on that. As to Meany, I have not the slightest doubt in my mind, from what I have known of his record, that he wants to get rid of the gangsters in the union organization. From what I know of Walter Reuther's record, he does not, and I will tell you why.

In the recent Kohler strike over in Sheboygan, Wis., not so long ago, what position did Walter take? He sent his righthand man, Emil Mazey, over there to engineer the strikers' activities. They, the pickets, disregarded all law, violated or decried the civil rights of all who opposed them. Mazey is the boy who stands back, and I know this from previous investigations at Dowagiac, Mich., at St. Joe, Mich., and at Clinton, Mich. This man Mazey, who is Reuther's righthand man, is the general on the spot; he is just as yellow as a man can be, and just as lawless. We had him on the witness stand. We know of his activities. Here is what he usually did—at least, he did in this case: He stands back and he tells the pickets, sometimes professional pickets, goons many times, wearing those iron hats, sometimes with a dumbbell, an iron one, in the hand this way, backing up to the plate-glass windows, as they did in Detroit when the strike was on against the automobile dealers, smashing the windows in back of them; he tells the pickets to go ahead, encourages them to do the actual fighting. Mazey stands back and encourages them to go on. Then, when some of the fellows who follow his advice get caught by the police, that is, one of the pickets, big, brave Mazey is in the clear. And he testified at St. Joe—he had to admit it—he testified at St. Joe he had been arrested many times; but he boasted proudly of the fact that he had never been convicted, which he had not up to that time. He is always the bird that is back behind, a yellow individual who has no regard for the law, who incites violence, but hides back in the crowd. He lacks the courage to do his own dirty work. Unfortunately for him, over at Sheboygan he went a little too far afield, and they nailed him and they convicted him, and that, as I understand, was the first time.

While we are on the subject, and so that my Democratic friends will not get too much credit for the Senate investigation to which Riesel referred, I want to call their attention to the fact that when a man named Flynn was convicted at St. Joe, Mich., and in spite of the fact that many automobiles have been damaged during strikes, and when the jury found that the damage was enough to make the offense a felony and the judge sent him to State's prison, one of the great candidates—you better strike the "great"—one of the candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination, our governor, Mr. Williams, pardoned him shortly thereafter, and within 2 weeks the pardoned violator of the law was down on the picket line at Sturgis, Mich. In this Sheboygan strike one of Reuther's and Mazey's boys went over there and beat up one of the workers. I do not recall whether the man died or not, but, in any event, there was a fugitive warrant sent out for him after he es-

caped to Michigan. Governor Williams was protecting the crook—I withdraw "crook"—the alleged crook and refused to send him back to Wisconsin for trial. As I understand it, the Federal court has ordered him to appear before the National Labor Relations Board and testify on a matter pending before the Board. Whether Wisconsin will get him for trial on the criminal charge I do not know. Williams says the man would not get a fair trial in Wisconsin if returned there. Of course, that is all nonsense. If Williams tried him—he would not try him; he would issue him a pardon in advance. What Williams is doing is making Michigan a State of refuge for those charged with crime committed in another State. So when you say Reuther wants to clean up, I say no; he does not want to clean up; he never has wanted to clean up. He has been a party all the time, since December of 1937, to encouraging violence in Michigan. He was in the sit-down strikes in 1937. He was one of the boys on the overpass in the Ford Detroit strike, where he and Frankenstein took a licking because they underestimated the physical ability of the workers. Just read what I put in the *Record* about Walter Reuther. He is the bird who went to Russia to get part of his education—he and his brother Victor. He is the bird who wrote back that letter from Russia to some of the workers in Detroit in which he said, "Fight for a Soviet America." Do not put any credence in Walter Reuther or Emil Mazey or any of the leaders of their goon squads.

Meany? Yes; if given the authority, I think he will clean house. But Reuther? No; and he will prevent Meany doing a job if he can. Hundreds of thousands of loyal workers, members of unions, want to go along with law enforcement. That is what my mail indicates and has indicated over the years. It has been that way all the time. There are only a few, just a sprinkling here and there, who are doing the dirty work and who are bringing discredit upon the unions.

PRESSURE ON CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS TO RETURN TO THE COUNTRY OF THEIR ORIGIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks there have paraded before a committee of the United States Senate a number of aliens who have been telling a most unusual and harrowing story concerning the attempts being made by the Iron Curtain countries to persuade these people to return home. Many of them are afraid because they say that they made misrepresentations when they came into the United States and are fearful lest they be deported.

At the time the basic Immigration and Nationality Code was drafted, in 1952, the conferees of the House and Senate

knew all about those people who had made misrepresentations as to the place of their birth at the time they left the continent of Europe. Many of these people swore that they were born in countries other than Russia because we at that moment were parties to the forcible repatriation program, a terrible blot on our history. These people knew that if they were sent back to Communist Russia they would suffer in many respects.

As a matter of fact, I was at a camp in Germany when a Russian repatriation team was interrogating people there endeavoring to prevail upon them to go home. I asked the Russian colonel in charge of the team what success he was having. He smiled and said, "Two have been prevailed upon to leave this camp." I then said to him, "They are afraid to go to Russia." And he said, "Well, they know that they have much to answer to."

These are the people who later swore that they came from places other than Russia when they made their application for admission to the United States. But with that knowledge before the conference committee we wrote in our report and in section 243 (h) of the Code broad enough language under which the Attorney General of the United States can withhold deportation so that these people may come forward and tell the truth as to the places of their birth instead of continuing the lie under which they came to the United States. We have broadened this authority recently in the bill H. R. 6888, which has already passed the House.

I do not know what you have to do to call to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States this section 243 (h) of the law, but there it is. In the conference report, part of which I wrote myself, we spelled out this situation. I sincerely trust that the Attorney General of the United States in his wisdom will send to the immigration districts the necessary information so that these people who are in the United States unlawfully because of this technicality may remain in this country as they so fervently desire to do.

WALTER REUTHER AND BROTHERHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a very deep personal affection for the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who represents the district in which I was born. Ours is a friendship that transcends differences in political convictions and in philosophies. I regret that my good friend on this primary day, when we have little legislative business and plenty of time on our hands, felt moved to spread a feast of joyance in the laps of those on his side of the aisle who easily are tickled into hilarity by verbal brickbats hurled at the champions of labor and the upholders of the rights and dignity of men and women who toil in the trades and crafts. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who

never is dull, surpassed himself in this feast of joyance, in honor I take it, and lacking any better reason, of primary day in Iowa.

Seated in the Chamber listening was the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and when she heard Mr. Reuther mentioned in manner disrespectful of Mr. Reuther's great and overshadowing contribution to the better world in which we live, and mentioned also of one of the great governors that my native State of Michigan has ever had, the present governor of Michigan, the gentlewoman from Oregon wished and prepared to reply; but duty was calling her to her committee and she had to leave, so I ask unanimous consent that her remarks may be extended immediately following my remarks here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was on another matter that I asked time, not a matter of personalities, but to bring to this House a message of good cheer from the great Second Congressional District of Illinois. It does have, however, a relationship to the subject of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, since one of the causes to which Mr. Reuther and the great governor of Michigan have devoted themselves is that of brotherhood.

Yesterday, in Woodlawn, in the heart of the district that I represent, a new minister came to the 59-year-old Sixth United Presbyterian Church, a church that in these 59 years had had no worshiper not of the white race. The new minister that came yesterday to preside over that flock is a Negro, the Reverend Abraham Lincoln Reynolds, Jr., called by the vote of a white congregation.

Integration in the great Second District of Illinois is an accomplished fact. By reaching for brotherhood we have attained it.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in and heartened by the account of the coming of the Reverend Mr. Reynolds to the Woodlawn Church, as told in the following news article from the Chicago Sun-Times of June 4, 1956:

NEGRO CLERIC FILLS WOODLAWN PULPIT

(By Dolores McCahill)

"You know without a question the Sixth (Woodlawn) United Presbyterian Church is integrated," the new pastor said in presenting his family.

The introduction was made Sunday by Dr. A. L. Reynolds, Jr., new Negro pastor of the church at 62d and Woodlawn, on behalf of his wife Louise and their two sons, Leroy and Abraham Lincoln Reynolds III.

After preaching his first sermon to his new congregation, Dr. Reynolds received into its membership the first two members of his race other than his own family.

FIFTY-NINE-YEAR-OLD CHURCH

The congregation, which previously numbered 159 whites and a girl with Japanese ancestry, decided to call a Negro minister to show that Negroes would be welcome in the 59-year-old church. It stands on a street which has a number of Negro residents.

The church met overflow success in its attempt to attract Negroes to the service. For the first time since Easter of 1952, sliding panels were raised so that worshippers unable

to find places in the pews could participate in the service from the Sunday school assembly room at the side.

Attendance had been from 50 to 65 on Sundays for the past 4 months, while 263 persons came to Dr. Reynolds' first sermon. The chief usher, Alexander Stevenson, estimated the congregation to be about 60 percent Negro and 40 percent white. Dr. Reynolds from his pulpit thought he saw more Negroes than whites though he hadn't been thinking in those terms.

Extending the invitation to membership, the minister said "We are a group of people here who only see people. I can't help but believe the Saviour of us all smiles this morning as we work together in His name and for His cause."

Those who joined yesterday were David G. Hayes of 6431 South University, a real estate agent, and Mrs. George W. Prince of 6136 South Greenwood, substitute high school teacher.

BELIEVED PRECEDENCE

Officers of the Sixth United Presbyterian Church believe it was the first white congregation in Chicago to bring a Negro to its pastorate. It is thought to be the second United Presbyterian congregation in the country to adopt a program of interracial membership. One in St. Louis already had done so, they said.

Asked whether he regarded the new interracial character of his congregation as permanent or transitional, Dr. Reynolds said: "My aim is to serve the community. If the entire community becomes of one race, quite naturally the church would. But our doors are open to any nationality."

The minister previously served Mount Olive Methodist Church in Topeka, Kan., a Negro congregation. He chose Horizons Unlimited as the theme of his initial sermon here, telling the church members they shared "a challenge to lift our hearts by prayer, love, faith, and understanding."

The Chicago Tribune of June 4, 1956, gives the following account:

NEGRO PASTOR IN PULPIT OF WHITE CHURCH

The Sixth United Presbyterian church, 6161 Woodlawn avenue, the first white congregation in Chicago to appoint a Negro as its pastor May 11, became an integrated congregation yesterday.

The Reverend Dr. Abraham Lincoln Reynolds, Jr., 49, formerly of Topeka, Kans., assumed his pastorate at the 11 a. m. service. More than 300 persons, half of them Negroes, worshiped together in reciting psalms and singing hymns. An all white choir of 14 sang in the chancel, but whites and Negroes shared ushering assignments.

RECALLS CHRIST'S ORDER

Dr. Reynolds said in the invocation that "all men are created in the image of God," and recalled in the Scripture reading from the 16th chapter of St. Mark that Christ ordered his disciples to "preach the gospel to every living creature."

"There are some men who say all men and women cannot live and worship together," the pastor said. "But a Man who lived on this earth 1,900 years ago said it can be done."

During the service, Dr. Reynolds introduced his wife, Louise, and two children, Theon Le Roy, 11, and A. L. III, 8, to the congregation. A reception for the Reynolds family will be held in the church Friday night.

MANY LEAVE NEIGHBORHOOD

After the service, parishioners introduced themselves to each other. Monroe McMackin, sessions clerk of the church, explained that because of displacement of white families by Negro families, members living in the neighborhood had shrunk from 250 to 7 families although dozens who had

moved away continued to attend services.

After the congregation voted to keep the church in its present location the missions board of the United Presbyterian church assisted in the search for a pastor. Meanwhile parishioners began a canvass of the neighborhood in invite Negroes to attend the 59-year-old church.

First of the new parishioners to sign membership cards yesterday was David G. Hayes, 33, of 6431 University Avenue, a real estate salesman.

ECONOMIC AID IN THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act of 1956 will come to the floor next Wednesday. I thought it might be helpful to explain in advance some of the provisions in the bill which have not received much attention. There has been a great deal of discussion about the military part of this bill. Perhaps we forget that most of the money authorized in the bill is for economic aid of various kinds.

Of the \$3,563,475,000 total, \$1,550,700,000 is for furnishing military weapons, equipment and training; \$2,012,775,000 is for other purposes. This year, economic aid for direct forces support in the amount of \$374,300,000 was carried in the general military assistance request of \$2,925,000,000. Even though this request has been cut to \$1,925,000,000 in section 2 of the bill, I understand that the Executive is not planning to cut the spending for direct forces support, which is economic aid—food, clothing, gasoline, and so forth, for the support of troops.

Thus the authorizations for economic aid in the bill are as follows:

[In millions]

Direct forces support.....	\$374.3
Defense support.....	1,147.7
Development assistance.....	243.0
Technical cooperation.....	157.5
Other programs.....	90.3
Total (rounded).....	2,012.8

The first two items are for support of military effort. Every item is designed to promote our own security. Most of the money authorized, however, is for economic aid, not weapons and training. The amount for guaranties is increased \$400 million in the bill, but is a contingent item and therefore is not shown as an increased authorization in the totals. If we add this amount to the authorizations available for economic aid under this bill, the total would be \$2,412,800,000 for economic aid compared to \$1,550,700,000 for strictly military aid.

LONG-TERM AID

This bill involves a considerable reappraisal of the Executive requests for economic aid, especially as to long-term aid to underdeveloped countries.

Recently, as part of their "new look," the Soviets have been offering technical assistance and economic aid to undeveloped countries.

We have been doing this for a number of years. A number of such programs are contained in existing law. The

President's Fund for Asian Development was created last year, for \$200 million to remain available until June 30, 1958. Development assistance was authorized in title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, with separate amounts for the Near East and Africa, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere.

This year's requests included a special authorization for the Middle East and Africa of \$100 million, and specific longer-term commitments for economic development up to 10 years of not to exceed \$100 million in any 1 year from any new funds made available.

The committee reappraised this program. There is no termination date in the mutual security law and therefore any amendment expressed in terms of years would be shorter in duration technically speaking than the law it amended. We also realize that no Congress can pass a law its successor cannot amend or repeal.

Therefore the committee adopted a carefully worded statement of policy—see section 7 of the bill—of continuing aid to free nations as long as this danger to the peace of the world and our own security persists, and then rearranged and combined the various programs of development assistance by an amendment I offered.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Assistance for economic development of their resources has been furnished to many countries in the past, including countries carrying on military programs as part of their defense support—see title I. This can be done under the present bill. In recent years, however, the words "development assistance" have come to have a special meaning; substantial economic aid in addition to technical assistance in countries which do not have military programs in the common defense. This applies especially to underdeveloped countries.

This year a number of separate programs of this character were requested. The requests were for \$370 million, as follows:

President's Asian fund..... \$100,000,000

Title II—Development assistance:

Near East and Africa.....	63,000,000
Asia.....	80,000,000
Latin America.....	27,000,000

Total title II..... 170,000,000

Middle East..... 100,000,000

Development assistance request..... 370,000,000

We put the request for Latin America in title I—defense support, as being more appropriate for neighbors who are joined together in treaties for defense against communism, even though they may not be carrying on joint military programs. We increased this amount by \$5 million. This left \$370 million in the development assistance category, as follows:

Development assistance request.....	\$370,000,000
Deduct Latin America (transferred).....	27,000,000

Development assistance request..... 343,000,000

We reduced this total request by \$100 million and, in section 4 of the bill, authorized \$243 million, to remain available until June 30, 1960, for economic development in free Asia, the Middle East and Africa. We did not divide the amount among these regions, but not more than 25 percent is to go any one nation. All of it is to be in loans or surplus agricultural commodities, except for regional projects involving 2 or more nations. We wish to encourage regional projects, but although the present law requires preference for such programs in the Asian fund, we learned—hearings, page 453—that only one-third of the \$66.6 million programed is for regional projects.

LOANS

The present law provides in 3 places that the program "shall emphasize loans rather than grants, wherever possible." The efforts this year have been "disappointing," to quote Mr. Hollister, Director of ICA—hearings, page 49—probably about the same as last year's \$209 million.

The requirements of the development assistance section should improve this record.

The Soviets furnish all of their economic aid, except for technical assistance, in the form of loans or barter deals. There is little or nothing in the record to show that we need to make outright grants to compete with them in neutral underdeveloped countries.

There is a popular misconception, stimulated by banking minds and by giveaway enthusiasts, that aid loans amount to grants, are never paid, and create hard feelings.

The record is otherwise. For instance, we received last year \$502 million in principal and \$273 million in interest on foreign-aid loans made since World War II according to the Department of Commerce. About one-fifth of our post-war aid of \$5 billion has been in credits. Under the mutual-security program and its predecessors 50 loans to 23 countries, totaling about \$1,868,000,000 have been made. This year \$15,126,672 is being paid on principal and \$37,651,945 in interest on these loans.

We are becoming a have-not country in essential raw materials. Any long-term development plans for other countries should include long-term repayments which can be made in raw materials we will need increasingly. This bill stresses this policy.

GUARANTIES

This bill—section 6 (k)—provides authority to guarantee \$400 million in private investments by an amendment I offered, in addition to the estimated \$100 million which will be issued by June 30. A fractional reserve is set up, in line with insurance practice instead of a 100 percent reserve. In addition to insuring convertibility of currencies, and against expropriation or confiscation, coverage may include losses caused by war, revolution, and insurrection.

Up to date we have had no losses on investment guarantees, and the reserve is maintained by issuance of notes which do not require appropriations. Over \$293 million in applications are now

pending. We charge a fee for guaranties. Our whole foreign-aid program is to assure that we will not have a war, and that we will end up with a peaceful free world where people respect private property and pay their debts. If we can secure private investment in underdeveloped countries by charging a fee to protect the investor against the risks we have spent billions to prevent, we can cut the amount of Government-aid programs.

Up to date, Government officials and bureaucrats here and abroad, and also businessmen here and abroad, when given the choice of grants, loans, or guaranties in foreign-aid programs, have usually chosen grants. In this case, flexibility has been expensive. When the choice has been loans or nothing, they choose loans. As grant money has been reduced, interest in guaranties has increased. By tightening up on grants, but opening up on loans and guaranties, for economic development, we hope to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment costing our Government nothing, or loans, where we are repaid. That is the capitalistic system that developed our country and most of the free world. We believe it is better than the Communist system, and will prove itself in competition.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODES OF 1939 AND 1954

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and for other purposes.

CERTAIN RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS AND INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 10 minutes, on today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. WILLIS), on Thursday, for 30 minutes.

Mr. IKARD, on tomorrow, for 30 minutes.
Mr. BAILEY, on tomorrow, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include an outstanding address by Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. WALTER and include an address he delivered at the national convention, notwithstanding the estimated cost will amount to \$287.

Mr. KEARNS on the bill H. R. 10424.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the Act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowance for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1918. A letter from the president, the bar association of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia, to require the maintenance of an official publication for said government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1919. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1920. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1921. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 752 of title 28 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 31, 1956, the following bills were reported June 1, 1956:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10766. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II, with amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations (Rept. No. 2252). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid (Rept. No. 2253). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted June 4, 1956]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 521. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination; without amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11544. A bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2512. An act to amend the Act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9828. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11522. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7888. A bill to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Wellwell, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants; without amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8005. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of soldiers killed in battle; with amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:
H. R. 11569. A bill to provide for effecting the disposition of the Illinois and Mississippi

Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11570. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries and wildlife; to strengthen the fisheries and wildlife segments of the national economy; to create and establish within the Department of the Interior the office of Under Secretary of Fisheries and Wildlife, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11571. A bill to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11572. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place marine sextants on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 11573. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11574. A bill to amend paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 11575. A bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development for each of the three military departments within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 11576. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11577. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 11578. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11579. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11580. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11581. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11582. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954 so as to provide for a passport review procedure and to prohibit the issuance of passports to persons going or staying abroad to support the Communist movement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY (by request):

H. J. Res. 632. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the T2-SE-A2 tankers, *Mission San Antonio* and *Mission De Pala*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to inves-

tigate and study tariff and trade laws, regulations, practices, and policies, with reference to their effect on industry, labor, and agriculture in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. Hiestand:

H. Res. 523. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of labor racketeering in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Cretella:

H. R. 11583. A bill for the relief of Denise Curkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Cunningham:

H. R. 11584. A bill for the relief of Estelle Carlson as guardian of Hulda Ahlberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Gross:

H. R. 11585. A bill for the relief of Plutarco Pecina Sierra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMillan:

H. R. 11586. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Cornelia W. Heiss, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Mahon:

H. R. 11587. A bill for the relief of Shakeeb Dakour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Pelly:

H. R. 11588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norberta Cueto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Radwan:

H. R. 11589. A bill for the relief of O. J. Glenn & Son, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Rogers of Colorado:

H. R. 11590. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Duff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Walter:

H. R. 11591. A bill for the relief of Antonio Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1098. By Mr. Bush: Petition of John Q. Timbrell and 90 residents of Bloomsburg and Columbia County, Pa., urging immediate

enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1099. By Mr. Siler: Petition of Dr. David A. Cavin, president, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Springfield, Mo., and Jesse M. Seaver, director, Carolina Christian Union, Roanoke Rapids, N. C., on behalf of some 1,800 delegates and members of the Baptist Bible Fellowship at their annual national meeting at Springfield, Mo., urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, and the Langer bill, S. 923, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1100. Also, petition of Dr. David A. Cavin, president, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Springfield, Mo., and Jesse M. Seaver, director, Carolina Christian Union, Roanoke Rapids, N. C., on behalf of some 1,800 delegates and members of the Baptist Bible Fellowship at their annual national meeting at Springfield, Mo., urging the Congress to approve House Joint Resolution 312, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and which is known as the Christian amendment resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Water and Land Conservation and Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present a brilliant address delivered to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its 43d annual convention at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956. Senator Stuart Symington, former Secretary of the Air Force, presents in a most able and constructive manner the problems of water utilization throughout the United States and gives, as far as I know, for the first time his views on what may be the No. 1 internal problem within our country.

The speech is as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to discuss one of the Nation's most urgent problems—the conservation and use of our water and land resources.

History shows that every civilization which has risen to world prominence has done so only in areas where the soil was fertile; and where pure water was abundant.

It was not by coincidence that man's first cities were built along the fertile banks of the Tigris-Euphrates River in Mesopotamia; and along the Nile River in Egypt.

These areas were the "cradles" of early civilization.

It is a historical fact that no nation has long maintained a leading world position after either its soil or water supply became depleted.

As illustration, Rome was perhaps the proudest of all ancient empires.

But by the second century A. D. that Empire had become so impotent agriculturally

the historian, Simkovitch, was moved to write:

"Province after province was conquered by Rome to feed the growing proletariat . . . Latium, Campania, Sardinia, Sicily, Spain, Northern Africa, as Roman granaries were successively reduced to exhaustion. Abandoned land in Latium and Campania turned into swamps; Northern Africa into a desert. The forest-clad hills were denuded."

In other words, when the Roman Empire became an agricultural parasite, like all other parasites, it perished when its sources of food became exhausted.

History's greatest lesson may be the fact adequate water and land are prerequisites not only to improved living standards but also to national survival.

When the United States was first settled some 350 years ago timber, water, and rich soil existed in great abundance.

But the population grew steadily and the consumption of soil products and water steadily increased; and therefore shortly after the year 1900 we realized that shortages were possible even in America.

As a result President Theodore Roosevelt initiated the Nation's first conservation program.

Then came World War I with its tremendous drain on our productive capacity; and later the gigantic growth in our industrial complex during the 1920's.

By the early 1930's the complete exhaustion of our natural land and water resources could be foreseen; and so, under the leadership of another Roosevelt, our Government undertook to carry out the greatest reclamation, conservation, and resources development program ever conceived in all history.

Vast tracts of arid desert became areas of fertile productivity. Denuded hills were reforested. Depleted agricultural plains were first fertilized and then sown in grass and grain. Multiple-purpose reservoirs were constructed.

This was a program to preserve our greatest heritage—the soil and water of America.

With the exception of the air we breathe, water is the material most vital to human life. It is the largest single controlling factor

in the growth of population, in the growth of industry, and in the growth of agriculture.

Because we of America were particularly blessed with an initial abundance of fresh water, we can only blame ourselves for that lack of foresight which in turn now forces us to face up to this impending water shortage.

As our population increases we must devote ever more attention to the elimination of water waste through uncontrolled floods, lack of conservation practices, and stream pollution.

In all probability within 20 years water will be the most critical scarcity of all our national resources.

According to the Hoover Commission, in 1975 water consumption will be 1½ times greater than it was in 1950, but in 1950 we were already suffering serious water shortages in many areas, a trend that is increasing each year.

Last fall the chief of the fish and game division of the Missouri Conservation Commission warned about this problem, as follows:

"Approximately three-fourths of the earth's surface is water, one-fourth land. I contend that the Lord made the earth that way because that is the relative importance of the two. Regardless of what anyone may believe, however, the fact remains that life on this earth, in all its forms and facets, has developed and must live accordingly.

"Water is our most important resource. The available supply of fresh, pure water is an absolute deadline beyond which no community, state, or nation can ever go. When humanity runs out of clean water everything stops—that is the end of the road for man and all his activities."

The growing domestic, industrial, irrigation, and power needs for water make imperative the adoption of a national water policy which will insure the development of our new water supplies.

To that end the following six steps, some now being taken haltingly, some not at all, should be followed resolutely:

There should be a coordinated program of flood control, water storage, and power development through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs, wherever feasible, on the water arteries of the Nation.